CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL
of the
PACIFIC
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/theology_1950-01_53_355

THEOLOGY

VOL. LIII JANUARY, 1950 No. 355

Editorial

WE will not take sides in the vexatious dispute whether the second half of the twentieth century begins on January 1, 1950, or on January, 1, 1951, nor need we suppose that either of these dates will seem particularly important to future historians. But to men who are at present alive it is natural at this time to wonder what the next fifty years have in store for the Church and for the world, and how they will compare with the past fifty years. It is possible that, despite all our present and too well-grounded pessimism, the twentieth century will see a transition as remarkable and as unexpected as the nineteenth. For the vulgar fashion of regarding confidence in progress as characteristic of the whole of the nineteenth century ignores the fact that its first half was occupied quite as much with alarms and crises and pessimistic expectations as the first half of this century has been.

On January 1, 1850, Disraeli wrote to Count D'Orsay: "What are you going to do, and can anything be done in your unfortunate country? England is only sinking. France is finished. What a mournful fate to be born in the decline and fall of great countries! Europe, at least the Europe of our fathers and our youth, approaches its end. We ought to have found our careers across the great waters."[1] Such gloomy prognostications were common at the time. We do not refer to them in order to suggest that our present anxieties and apprehensions are exaggerated. But history has always been full of surprises, except when it has already happened, and there is no reason why it should cease to be so.

* * * * *

The Christian Faith is neither optimistic nor pessimistic about the course of history, though Christians during the past fifty years have swung from one extreme to the other. No contemporary theologian has done more than Dr Reinhold Niebuhr to illuminate the Christian understanding of historical existence. His latest book, *Faith and History*,[2] which may be regarded as a sequel to his Gifford Lectures, is directly devoted to this subject in all its ramifications. He compares and contrasts the Biblical insights into the nature and meaning of history with the classical view, on the one hand, and with modern views, on the other. There have recently been a good many essays in a Christian philosophy of history. Dr Niebuhr would say, rightly we think, that there cannot be a Christian philosophy of history if that means the reduction of history to coherence by any

[1] Moneypenny and Buckle, *Life of Disraeli*, iii, 166.

[2] Nisbet. 16s. The proofs have been carelessly read, and some sentences, *e.g.*, on pp. 48 and 69, are unintelligible as they stand.

,53
950

system of thought. All meanings, like all movements and achievements, in history (not least ecclesiastical movements and achievements) are ambiguous, provisional, and problematic. There is, however, a Christian theology of history which accepts the relativity of all meanings and the incompleteness of all achievements, and which can preserve men both from *hybris* and from despair as they shoulder the responsibilities that life brings to them.

In unfolding the implications of such a theology, Dr Niebuhr again and again enlightens, if he does not unravel, some of the knottiest problems that bewilder thoughtful men as they look out into the world or inwards to their own conflicting dispositions. But the difficulty with this kind of theology is that it is so difficult. To every question that is asked it seems to answer both Yes and No; it can hardly make a positive statement without proceeding at once to qualify it, or attending it with what is very nearly a contradiction. We believe that the truth for us is like that, but can we believe that it will prevail? Can it ever issue in a manifesto that will move the mind and imagination of the masses, or be capable of assimilation by the busy men of affairs who have to take the decisions that influence and alter the course of events? Can it be expressed in forms crude enough to compete with the too simple but also too powerful creeds which are now, and are always likely to be, its rivals? The constant task of the Christian man, whether he be a preacher or a man of affairs, must be to transmute the complications and refinements of a true theology into such crude and racy indicatives as will touch and direct the springs of action. Dr Niebuhr himself is, we know, able to do this, though we might not guess it from this book; but there are not many theologians who are even making the attempt.

What is to happen during the next fifty years may depend more than we can guess upon the emergence of theologians who have not been cultivated in conservatories, who have not learned their subject in a museum of the intellect, who do not buttress one another's orthodoxy or neo-orthodoxy, but who come at it in the sort of way that Amos did.

Gorham and Baptismal Regeneration[1]

THE Home Secretary, speaking about the Pastoral Reorganization Measure in the House of Commons on June 1, 1949, said that in his opinion it was an anachronism that such a topic should any longer be the concern of Parliament. This incident shows the extent to which the interest of the nation in ecclesiastical affairs has dwindled in the last hundred years. On March 8, 1850, Lord Langdale delivered the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of *Gorham* v. *the Bishop of Exeter*. *The Times* of the next day described the scenes near the Privy Council Chamber before the proceedings began: "The court-room of the Privy Council never, perhaps, on any former occasion, presented a more crowded and animated appearance. . . . It was some time before, amidst the scramble for places and the general confusion, the proceedings could be opened with becoming decorum."

George Cornelius Gorham, soon after his appointment to a fellowship at Queens' College, Cambridge, in 1811, sought ordination at the hands of Dr Dampier, the Bishop of Ely, and he became involved in a dispute with that prelate on the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Gorham stood firm, and the bishop eventually yielded. Apart from this brief encounter with episcopal authority, however, there is no evidence that Gorham's life pursued anything but a course of relatively even tenor until the occurrence of the controversy which must have occupied the greater part of the last ten years of his life. Until 1814 he resided in College, taking pupils and ministering around Cambridge; then he accepted a curacy at Beckenham. In May, 1818, he contested the Woodwardian professorship with Adam Sedgwick, losing the appointment by 59 votes against 186. In the meantime he made a study of botany, and possessed a valuable herbarium. From 1818 to 1827 he was curate of Clapham; in 1820 he published a book on the history of St Neots in Huntingdonshire and St Neots in Cornwall, with reference to the life of that saint. He held curacies at Maidenhead and Fawley near Henley, and in 1846 he was presented by Lord Lyndhurst to the benefice of St Just-in-Penwith in Cornwall. In the course of his career he published some treatises on genealogical and historical subjects and also some studies of the Apocrypha and the Book of Enoch. No record is left of any serious interruption of these liberal activities, and it was not until the summer of 1846 that any sign of the gathering storm began to appear. Gorham advertised for a curate "free from Tractarian error" to assist him in his apostolic labours at St Just-in-Penwith. This style of framing his request was hardly a breach of the forthright manners of the nineteenth century; nevertheless, it incurred the wrath of that notably irascible divine Dr Henry Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter. When a curate was forthcoming, Dr Phillpotts insisted that he must submit to a test of orthodoxy on his

[1] I am indebted to the Dacre Press for permission to use in this article matter from my forthcoming book *Gorham and the Bishop of Exeter*.

336359

doctrine of Baptism; this led to a protest from Gorham and to further deterioration of relations with his diocesan. In August, 1847, the Lord Chancellor (Cottenham) presented Gorham to the vicarage of Brampford Speke near Exeter, and thereupon the Bishop refused to institute him until he too had submitted to an investigation of the soundness of his doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Dr Phillpotts kept Gorham waiting until December 17 before the proceedings began; on that and the five following days the interrogations and answers lasted thirty-six hours. The examination was then suspended until March 8, 1848, and on that day and the two subsequent days another fourteen hours were given to this inquisition.

On March 11, 1848, the Bishop announced that he had found Gorham's doctrine of Baptism to be contrary to that contained in the Articles and formularies of the Church of England, and that therefore he declined to institute him to the benefice of Brampford Speke. Gorham then opened proceedings in the Court of Arches, which terminated in the judgment of Sir Herbert Jenner Fust of August 2, 1849, that the Bishop of Exeter had acted rightly in refusing to institute a clerk of Gorham's views. Hereupon the redoubtable Gorham appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; prolonged proceedings which excited nation-wide interest ensued, and on March 8, 1850, judgment was pronounced in favour of Gorham. Phillpotts appealed without avail to the courts of Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer to prevent the decision of the Privy Council from being put into effect, yet still he refused to institute the new Vicar of Brampford Speke. Gorham was eventually instituted on August 6, 1850, under *fiat* of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

This case brought into open conflagration the smouldering controversy on Baptism which had been taking place during the first half of the nineteenth century. Mant's Bampton Lectures appeared in 1816, and in the same year Laurence published his *Doctrine of the Church of England upon the Efficacy of Baptism*. These were followed in 1821 by Bethell's *General View of the Doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism*. In 1835 Pusey wrote his three tracts on *Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism*. In 1837 G. S. Faber's *Primitive Doctrine of Justification*, bearing on the matter, was published. Goode's *Effects of Infant Baptism* and R. I. Wilberforce's answer to it, *The Doctrine of Holy Baptism*, both came in 1849; then came the vast output of literature at the time of the Gorham case itself. This particular stage of the discussion may be said to have been wound up with the publication of Mozley's *Baptismal Controversy* in 1862.

The Gorham case and judgment gave rise to a violent storm of controversy in which eminent lawyers and statesmen as well as ecclesiastics and theologians were involved. Over ninety pamphlets on the doctrine of Baptism were published in the years 1849-50, and many more on the questions of the relations between Church and State to which the case directed attention. Gladstone[1] and Sidney

[1] Gladstone's pamphlet *Remarks on the Royal Supremacy* (1850) was provoked by the decision of the Privy Council in this case.

Herbert were profoundly concerned with the outcome of the dispute, and lawyers such as James Hope and Edward Badeley regarded the issue as momentous. Purcell, Manning's biographer, remarks that this "great ecclesiastical drama" had shaken the religious world to its depths for nearly three years. It was the Gorham case that finally drove Manning into the arms of Rome, though it was the Church and State aspect of it that influenced him most. Pusey, Keble, Robert Wilberforce, W. H. Mill, William Goode were all involved.

Although the judgment cannot be said to settle any of the vast problems besetting the modern student of the doctrine of Baptism, and although it does no more than raise important questions on the right of a "secular" court to pronounce on such a matter, the centenary of the case provides an opportunity for reconsidering the doctrinal issues raised by the two main disputants. There is a strong temptation to come to the facile conclusion that Phillpotts is right and Gorham wrong or the reverse, but a study of the original questions and replies[1] reveals that neither really answers the other. The honest High Churchman has to admit that Phillpotts's position is not entirely satisfactory, and the realistic Evangelical has to confess that Gorham's doctrine is inadequate. Where, then, shall wisdom be found? That is precisely the problem which the baptismal controversy raises, and this article is a plea that in 1950, the centenary year of the Gorham Judgment, theologians who have ears to hear should let George Cornelius Gorham and Henry Phillpotts ask their questions again.

Bishop Phillpotts began his inquisition by asking Gorham to prove from Scripture that Baptism is necessary to salvation. Gorham's reply to this contains the essence of his contentions:[2]

> In our Lord's discourse with Nicodemus it is said: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John iii, 5). If the allusion be to Baptism (which, however, had not then been instituted), it undoubtedly affirms the necessity of complying with that solemn Institution, where no unavoidable impediment intervenes. Having been ordained of Christ, it cannot be slighted without the awful consequences of disobedience to his express command. But it does not appear to me that the being "born of water," and the being "born of the Spirit," are so indissolubly tied together by this declaration, that each is *equally and in the same sense* necessary to salvation. This view is confirmed by the fact that the expression, "born again," is used in this discourse in verses 3, 6, 7, 8 without any reference to being "born of water," but twice with express mention of being "born of the Spirit" as the great essential requisite. It is confirmed also by verses 16, 17, where "everlasting life" and salvation are positively connected with "belief" in the Son of God without reference to Baptism; as if for the very purpose of showing that faith is an *indispensable and essential condition*, but that Baptism is only *generally necessary*, a condition to be dutifully performed.
>
> Precisely the same conclusion must be drawn from the terms used by our Lord in his express institution of Baptism: "He that believeth and is

[1] *The Efficacy of Baptism: Examination before Admission to a Benefice by the Bishop of Exeter.* By G. C. Gorham. (Hatchards, 1848.)

[2] First question and answer in *The Efficacy of Baptism.*

baptized shall be saved" (Mark xvi, 16). The *general* connexion between the *sign* which he has ordained for admission to his Church, and the *faith* which that sign certifies, is here distinctly affirmed. But our Lord adds, "He that believeth not shall be damned." Here exclusion from everlasting salvation is grounded, not on the omission of *Baptism*, but on the withholding belief in the Son of God.

The question at issue becomes particularly pressing in the practice of the Baptism of infants who, it is alleged, are incapable of being prepared for the sacrament or of making any conscious response at the time of its administration. Phillpotts understands valid Baptism to be "by a lawful minister, with water, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," and he asks Gorham: "Does our Church hold, and do you hold, that all infants, so baptized, are born again of water and of the Holy Ghost?" Gorham refused to be tied by passages in the Prayer Book which "in their naked verbality" appear to say that all persons validly baptized are *ipso facto* regenerated unconditionally. He quotes from the Preface of the Book of Common Prayer that the services "contain in them nothing contrary to the Word of God . . . or which is not fairly defensible . . . if it shall be allowed such just and favourable construction as in common equity ought to be allowed to all Human Writings, especially such as are set forth by authority." Strangely Phillpotts does not quote from the Baptism service, "Seeing now, dearly beloved, that this child is regenerate . . . ," but he fastens on the general rubric, "It is certain by God's Word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." At all events Gorham claimed that the "just and favourable construction" of these statements was to be sought by reference to three standards—first, the *general* sense of the formularies as opposed to the apparent meaning of a passage quoted in isolation; secondly, the XXXIX Articles, "the Church's explicit standard of doctrine"; and thirdly, the general view in the writings of those by whom the services were reformed and the Articles sanctioned.

The Prayer Book.—The Catechism, Gorham asserted, clearly distinguishes between the inward and spiritual grace of sacraments and their outward and visible signs. Although the Catechism does not explicitly say it, it implies that the former only accompanies the latter when the sacraments are rightly received. Repentance and faith are said to be required of all those who are to be baptized, even of infants who enter into stipulations by representatives. The statements in the Baptism service that the baptized are regenerated are made, Gorham claims, on the "charitable hypothesis" that the condition of faith has been satisfied.

The Articles.—Article XXV declares that Sacraments only "have a wholesome effect or operation" upon such as "worthily receive the same." Article XXVI says that the "grace of God's gifts" is conferred on those "who by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments." Article XXVII says "they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church . . ."

The Reformers.—In the verbal examination Gorham cited Coverdale, Latimer, Ridley, Cranmer, and Hooper as marking in unmistakable language the possibility of a separation of the grace of a sacrament from its outward sign. He quoted Jewel: "In Baptism, as the one part of that Holy Mystery is Christ's blood, so is the other part the material water: neither are these two parts joined together in place, but in mystery; and therefore they be oftentimes severed, and the one is received without the other."[1]

All this made Gorham feel justified in asserting the principle in relation to sacraments that "Where there is no worthy reception, there is no bestowment of grace," and that in the case of infant baptism there must be an act of prevenient grace to make the recipient "worthy" and able to receive the sacrament effectively. High Churchmen do not take kindly to these notions, but the doctrine of Dr Phillpotts that all infants are regenerated unconditionally in and by Baptism does not make the problem any simpler. Are we not then depriving infants of heavenly blessings in declining to baptize them by force or subterfuge even against the will of their parents?

It is impossible to understand the significance of this controversy and the fierce acerbity to which it gave rise at the time without examining carefully the details of the intricate arguments which were employed on both sides. For instance, Phillpotts tried to tie Gorham down to a particular view of the stipulations into which godparents enter at Baptism. "Is the entering of infants into these stipulations, by their representatives, necessary to their receiving the spiritual grace of Baptism?" Gorham replies that no exact answer to this question can reasonably be expected, quoting from His Majesty's Declaration prefixed to the Articles that "further curious search" into such an abstract point should be laid aside, and that such inquiries should be "shut up in God's promises as they be generally set forth to us in the Holy Scriptures." In the case of infants baptized in an emergency without godparents entering into stipulations, although the Prayer Book declares that such infants are sufficiently baptized, Gorham held that the stipulations are entered into by implication through those who earnestly desire the Baptism and by the persons who administered it. He claimed that the conditional nature of the sacrament is maintained even in these cases because it is directed that if such children live the implied stipulations are to be formally adopted in church. Gorham maintained that the doctrine of the Articles and Prayer Book is that "Baptism is the sign or seal, either of the grace already given, or of repentance and faith, which are stipulated, and must be hereafter exercised." Remembering that the word "sign" in the minds of at least some of the early fathers means more than just an outward appearance but contains also within its meaning an element or proportion of the thing signified, we cannot dub Gorham as heretical merely on the ground of this utterance. He clearly has in mind the notion of an "effectual sign"—"if it is received 'rightly, worthily, and by faith' it

[1] *Works*, Vol. I, p. 519 (Parker Society).

is an '*effectual* Sign' of God's 'grace' bestowed, which implanted a new nature and produced the faith both professed and possessed; and it is also a Sign of 'God's goodwill towards us' by which he 'strengthens' and confirms our 'faith' in him."[1]

The pleadings on behalf of Gorham before the Court of Arches and the decision of the judge in that court are both available and must be examined if a fair understanding of the importance attached to the case is to be arrived at.[2] Jenner Fust, in his judgment, agreed with Gorham that the XXXIX Articles were the Church of England's primary declaration of doctrine, but maintained that if the Articles were silent on any particular point recourse was to be had not to the opinions expressed elsewhere of those by whom the Articles were framed or the formularies of the Church compiled, but to the language of the formularies themselves. He quoted Burnet,[3] Waterland,[4] and Conybeare[5] in support of this thesis. In the Baptism service the prayers and exhortations before the actual baptism anticipate the reception of spiritual benefits, adoption, regeneration, and the like; and the parts of the service after the baptismal act assume that the child has been regenerated and so forth. This language, the judge said, cannot be regarded as merely expressing a charitable hope—it all assumes that the turning point has been made in the act of Baptism. But "It is sufficient for it [the court] to observe that Gorham's position is, that it is not by baptism, or through baptism, that grace is conferred." The report of the proceedings at Dr Phillpotts's examination is enough to show that this is a statement to which Gorham would not have subscribed. Jenner Fust went on to pronounce that in the case of adults being baptized the declarations of the Church were made on the hypothesis of the existence of sincere faith and repentance, but that the case of infants was totally different—this without making any attempt to meet the argument of Gorham that the Prayer Book and Articles imply that the principles in infant and adult baptism are the same. However, Jenner Fust was able to quote Nowell's *Catechism*, Bethell, Waterland, and Van Mildert in support of his judgment that the doctrine of the Church of England was that all infants are regenerated absolutely and unconditionally in Baptism.

Gorham could see enough chinks in this pronouncement to make it worth his while to appeal to the higher court. Dr Phillpotts's case before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was published under the title of *Substance of a speech delivered before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council*, by Edward Badeley,[6] and the final decision of the court is to be seen in *The Judgments on*

---

[1] Gorham, *op. cit.*

[2] *The Argument of Dr Bayford on behalf of the Rev. G. C. Gorham, in the Arches Court of Canterbury, March, 1849* (Seeleys, 1849); and W. J. Irons, *The Judgments on Baptismal Regeneration* (John Masters, 1850).

[3] *Pastoral Care*, ch. 6. [4] *Works*, vol. x, p. 186 (Oxford, 1823).

[5] *Treatise on the case of Subscription to the Articles* in *Enchiridion Theologicum*, vol. iii, pp. 262-3, 267 (Oxford, 1792).

[6] London: John Murray, 1850.

Baptismal Regeneration cited above. Badeley was a distinguished ecclesiastical lawyer who had espoused the tractarian cause, and he considered that the Gorham Judgment was such an admission of heresy into the Church of England that he seceded to the Church of Rome. His speech is a considerably more able and thorough presentation of the high church case in the baptismal question than Jenner Fust's judgment in the Court of Arches. He quotes extensively from the early fathers and councils and from the Anglican reformers and later divines, also from medieval doctors, and he goes most thoroughly into the intricate questions of Prayer Book interpretation which Gorham raised in the original examination.

Badeley's chief argument was that the Prayer Book is to be considered as having authority superior to that of the Articles for establishing the doctrine of the Church. The Articles are not precise—for instance, Article XXV, if it is taken as an exact statement, means that the sacrament of Confirmation is a "corrupt following of the Apostles," for it cannot possibly be said that it is a "state of life." He makes much of the word *signum*, quoting from the Latin of this Article that sacraments are *efficacia signa gratiæ*, sharply distinguishing this from *signaculum*; and he calls to his support St Zeno, who, speaking of Baptism, says: ". . . hoc Spiritus Sancti non signaculo sed signo censemur."[1] Badeley is the first in the controversy to say clearly that in the case of infants a standard of qualification is accepted different from that required in the case of adults: whereas faith and repentance must be present in the latter for them to receive the sacrament rightly, with infants their helplessness and freedom from actual sin authorizes them to be admitted to the Christian covenant. Challenged by Lord Campbell (one of the judges) that his position differed nothing from the *opus operatum* doctrine of the Church of Rome, he replied that the doctrine of the regeneration of all infants in Baptism was not derived from the schoolmen and was not a factor in the controversy about reception of grace *ex opere operato*. He held that the word *recte* in the phrase *recte baptismum suscipientes* in the Latin of Article XXVII referred to the due performance of the rite and not to the disposition of the recipients. Even the continental protestant reformers who influenced Cranmer were sound on this question of Baptism—Bucer, for instance, speaks of "Electum Dei genus, id est, per generationem Baptismi filios Dei factos."[2]

But all this was of no avail to obtain a decision against Gorham. The Archbishops of Canterbury (Sumner) and York (Musgrave) and the Bishop of London (Blomfield) attended the hearing of the appeal as episcopal assessors. The two Archbishops concurred with the judgment, but the Bishop of London, with one of the lay judges, expressed dissent. Judgment was given on March 8, 1850, that the rubrics and formularies are ambiguous on the point at issue, that the framers of the Articles intended latitude of interpretation on

[1] Lib. I, Tract. XIII, xi.
[2] *Epitome of the Christian's Doctrine and Religion.*

the question, and that therefore in view of the opinions of Anglican writers of acknowledged authority Gorham's doctrine was to be regarded as permissible within the Church of England. It is important to observe the Committee's statement of the doctrine of Baptism which it held to be Gorham's and which was declared to be admissible:

> That Baptism is a Sacrament generally necessary to salvation, but that the grace of regeneration does not necessarily accompany the act of Baptism that regeneration invariably takes place in Baptism (*sic*); that the grace may be granted before, in, or after Baptism; that Baptism is an effectual sign of grace, by which God works invisibly in us, but only in such as worthily receive it,—in them alone it has a wholesome effect; and that without reference to the qualifications of the recipient, it is not in itself an effectual sign of grace. That infants baptized, and dying before actual sin, are certainly saved; but that in no case is regeneration in Baptism unconditional.

The question of the relative authority of the Prayer Book and Articles was dealt with by saying that if there was a doctrine upon which the Articles are silent or ambiguously expressed, it must be supposed that it was intended to be left to private judgment unless the formularies clearly decide it. But if the rubrics and formularies are ambiguous it cannot be held that the Church intended to declare a point of doctrine indirectly there which it had failed to declare directly in the Articles. And the judges went on to introduce a theory of suspended operation of grace which had not hitherto been raised in the case. ". . . those who are strongly impressed with the earnest prayers which are offered for the Divine blessing, and the grace of God, may not unreasonably suppose that the grace is not necessarily tied to the rite; but that it ought to be earnestly and devoutly prayed for, in order that it may then, or when God pleases, be present to make the rite beneficial." The court refused to rely upon the writings of Anglican divines outside the Articles and formularies for its decision, but it did quote a number of authorities and remark that doctrines undistinguishable from Gorham's had been allowed without censure in the past. Among them Jewel: "This marvellous conjunction and incorporation with God, is first begun and wrought by faith: afterwards the same incorporation is assured to us, and increased by Baptism."[1]

Phillpotts refused to accept the decision and wrote an open *Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury*, of which Liddon says: "Few documents of the kind, since Law's letters to Hoadley, can rank in importance with this famous Protest. Deep conviction and commonsense, trenchant logic, and indignant irony are in their turn brought to bear with triumphant effect on the judgment of the Judicial Committee."[2] Phillpotts began with a violent attack upon Archbishop Sumner's *Apostolical Preaching*, a new edition of which had appeared in 1850, and he went on to deplore the "miserable uncertainty respecting the efficacy of his Baptism" which, according to the

[1] *Treatise on Private Mass*, pp. 140-1 (Parker Society).
[2] *Life of E. B. Pusey*, vol. iii, p. 229.

Archbishop's doctrine in his *Exposition of the Gospel of St John*, everybody baptized in infancy must have. In concurring with the judgment of the Privy Council, the Archbishop has done all he can to cut off the Church, in which he holds the highest place, from the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of all ages. He had misled the court, misstated the doctrine, and misquoted the authorities. The judgment has completely missed the point and glossed over the outrageous heresies of Gorham. "What would any of those judges have thought if . . . a man were charged with wilful murder, and the Judge were, in summing up, to omit noticing any evidence, beyond such as established manslaughter? . . . So much suppression of the truth converts a formal absolution of Gorham into a virtual condemnation of his doctrine. Grave charges thus glossed over are tacitly acknowledged, while the individual is acquitted. My lord, truth does not usually thus shun the light." And the letter ends with this cry of protestation:

> Meanwhile I have one most painful duty to perform. I have to protest not only against the Judgment pronounced in the recent cause, but also against the regular consequences of that Judgment. I have to protest against your Grace's doing what you will speedily be called to do, either in person, or by some other exercising your authority. I have to protest, and I do here solemnly protest, before the Church of England, before the Holy Catholic Church, before Him who is its Divine Head, against your giving mission to exercise cure of souls within my diocese, to a clergyman who proclaims himself to hold the heresies which Mr Gorham holds. I protest that anyone who gives mission to him till he retract, is a favourer and supporter of those heresies. I protest, in conclusion, that I cannot, without sin—and, by God's grace, I will not—hold communion with him, be he who may, who shall so abuse the high commission which he bears.
>
> I am, my Lord Archbishop, with that "due reverence and obedience" which I have pledged to you, and with earnest prayer that such reverence and obedience to you may never be forbidden by my duty to our common Master, your Grace's affectionate friend for nearly thirty years, and now your afflicted servant,
>
> H. Exeter.

Who can now be as confident as Liddon that he knows who or what was triumphant? Will someone be found, for instance, to analyse the terms "regeneration," "unconditional," "sign" which were used, and to light a way through this fog of theological controversy of a hundred years ago?

J. C. S. Nias, O.G.S.

The Fast Before Communion—I

There is need not of less preparation for Communion but of more. Those, therefore, who feel bound to reopen a discussion which (with all its literary history and its peculiar effect upon emotions) they would gladly have forgotten, do so not to establish a new low level of discipline or of demand upon communicants; not to make communion easier for the already easy-going; not, indeed, to ridicule or undermine an act of voluntary self-discipline practised by those who derive spiritual benefit from it. They do so because they are

uncertain of the authority which the teaching of this fast as an obligation has in the Church of England, and because they question the moral propriety of numbering breaches of this fast, without discrimination, among sins proper for confession. They do so because they observe that the Church of Rome, from which this discipline was reimported into the Church of England during the last century, is now so dispensing from its rigour over wide areas of the Continent as to reveal a wholly new attitude to the law. They do so, further, because they see, surveying the history of sixty to seventy years, that the alteration in times of service which this discipline demands has been accompanied (to say no more) by a decline in communicants, universally in number, locally in quality, and by a universal disturbance of proportion as between men and women and between different social groups or classes. They do so because by common consent the fixity of these times—Holy Communion before breakfast, Mattins mid-morning, and Evensong (only) after tea—is a mischievous pastoral impediment in industrial parishes where life is timed in shifts, and in united country parishes where two or more churches or centres of population are served by one priest. And they ask, finally, whether the attempt to remove this impediment by suppressing Mattins in favour of either a Parish Communion with but a stinted ministry of the Word, or a late Sung Eucharist with but elderly or no lay communicants, is not an act of surgery made necessary only by the taking of unnecessary physic?

The Editor of THEOLOGY, in March, 1949, brought the discussion to a point from which it may be resumed: reference was made to Dr Percy Dearmer's book, *The Truth about Fasting, with special reference to Fasting-Communion* (Rivingtons, 1928), and the question was asked, Have its contentions anywhere been refuted? Fr J. H. Crehan, S.J., replied in May (p. 178) that they had, and by Fr Herbert Thurston, S.J., in two articles published under the title, *The Eucharistic Fast* (Longmans, 1928). Since the book and the pamphlet are both rare it is the purpose of this article to review both, and to summarize recent papal dispensations as far as they have come under the writer's notice, and there to leave the subject to be pursued by those who will. It may well be that it will involve the more fundamental question of the value of the appeal to history and where that appeal has to stop.

Dearmer opens his case with a discussion of practical difficulties —of the effect, in town and country, of the disrupting of the old order, Mattins, Litany, and (Ante-)Communion, in favour of an early-morning Communion and a variety of happenings later on. He admits the urgent need for reform in the early nineteenth century; he would not defend the redundancies or the tedium which would still be involved if the three morning services were recited, unrevised, in full and in succession. But he is severely and justly critical of the now manifest results of the change where the fast is made a law, and the services are ordered accordingly. Historically he does less than justice to these early services when they were introduced

in addition to the normal round, and to the spiritual and pastoral zeal of those who used them. A report and debate in the Canterbury Lower House in 1874 on the Hours of Divine Service produced abundant instances: "An early Communion service for the chairmen employed in drawing the invalid chairs" at Leamington; a Communion for working men at 4 a.m. somewhere else, "with a large congregation"; and two factory chaplains at Nottingham conducting services (not the Communion) for workpeople in the works, at 8 a.m. On the other hand, he could have made more of the angry hostility roused by the suppression of the late Communion, and by the slick practice of those who, believing an enforced non-communicating attendance to be more pleasant to God than an orderly withdrawal of non-communicants, refused the customary pause in which they were wont to retire. So Dean Stanley, in the Lower House in 1873:

> "It is very curious to have lived from the time when people used to be urged at all hazards to receive the Holy Communion at every opportunity to a time when persons are exhorted and persuaded to be present in church without receiving the Holy Communion. . . . It is a proof that we should bear in mind how exceedingly fleeting and transitory exaggerated notions about the Eucharist are." (*Chronicle of Convocation,* 1873, p. 510; cp. 1872, p. 149; 1866, pp. 454 f., 562.)

So Archdeacon Freeman of Exeter, presenting *gravamina* in 1874:

> "The last and chief and most mischievous of all, the due receiving of the Holy Communion is in many ways discouraged and even forbidden, no opportunity for it being in some cases given. . . .
>
> "That the pretexts for this astounding depravation of the chief rite of the Gospel are one and all utterly devoid, as has been proved many times, of any truth or any countenance from antiquity, being such as these:
>
> "1. The necessity or at least the solemn duty of receiving fasting; which has been shewn, in a late and unanswerable pamphlet, to have been no primitive law at all, though it obtained a comparatively early prevalence, and is, in itself, pleasing and reverential." (*Ibid.,* 1874, p. 101 f.)

Dearmer, then, went not deeply enough into either side, the movement or the resistance; he missed, therefore, the significance of the revolution which he deplored: whether it has proved a blessing or a bane, whether it be suffered now to remain or not, it was a moral victory achieved by the superior spiritual stature of its champions. For hardly any other reason was the novelty of the early Communion universally established, while the contemporary novelty of the evening Communion was not. If this be a fact, it is one to be remembered on both sides in any new attempt at change; the decision will require more than academic argument.

Dearmer passes next to the teaching and example of our Lord, His treatment of ceremonial ordinances, and the temper in which they are obeyed, and of course to the Upper Room where it was "after supper" that He took Bread and the Cup. Very material to the argument is the difference between the A.V. and R.V. in four places, though again Dearmer does not follow far enough his own suggestion. In Mark ix, 29, Acts x, 30, and 1 Cor. vii, 5, the A.V. shows *fasting* conjoined with *prayer,* and at Matt. xvii, 21 it accepts

the adoption of the revised Mark ix, 29 into the Matthæan text. The textual evidence as Dearmer would have known it is set out, for all four verses, by Robertson and Plummer at 1 Cor. vii, 5, in the *I.C.C.* It will suffice for the present to look at the Marcan passage. *Fasting* does not appear in ℵ (Sinaiticus) or B (Vaticanus), the Alexandrian text of the fourth century, nor in *k* (Bobiensis), the best representative of the African Old Latin, and a text akin to St Cyprian's; and that agreement is enough to have excluded it from the R.V. More recent textual work adds weight and interest to the other side. *Fasting* is in A (Alexandrinus), and the Received, Byzantine, Text, and in the Peshitta Syriac; it is in the Western text, represented by D (Bezæ), and most MSS of the Old Latin Version, and so into the Vulgate. Whether from this source or another, it is in the Sinaitic Syriac. So far there is no obvious indication of the source of the interpolation, save that the home of the Western text is probably to be located in Africa. But when we examine the texts which lie between the Alexandrian and the Western, the field narrows. The interpolation appears in the Sahidic and Bohairic versions, from Upper and Lower Egypt; it appears in the Cæsarean readings in C (Ephraemi—c. V, Egypt). in W (Washington Codex, late c. IV or V), which has a Cæsarean text from Mark v, 31 on, and in Family Θ (the Koridethi Gospels, Θ, λ, the Lake Group, and φ, the Ferrar Group) again a Cæsarean text. It was added by the second corrector of ℵ, from a MS only one step removed from Origen in the library of Pamphilus at Cæsarea. That Origen used a Cæsarean text after his removal from Alexandria to Cæsarea in 231 is established; that he used it before he left Egypt is a probable conjecture, now strengthened by the evidence of the Chester Beatty papyri—P^{45} has a markedly Cæsarean text, it is written in a hand resembling that of the Washington Codex, though earlier, and it had, but has now lost, the interpolation.[1] This papyrus represents a tradition current in Egypt a century before the great Alexandrian codices were written; it points to Egypt as the source of the interpolation which runs through the representatives of the Cæsarean text.

What conclusion does this evidence invite? Such an addition to a saying of the Lord would come from a community with an ascetic temper, from the desert; the three MSS which have not admitted it come from, or are associated with, the city, the seat of authority, and theology, and regular catechetical instruction, and liturgical worship —Alexandria for ℵ *B*, Carthage, or at least its Bishop, for *k*. In the very period. then, in which the quest for precedents and authorities for the eucharistic fast begins, the zealots of the world-renouncing communities were beginning to inject into normal Christian society —for the city, the village, and the family *have* proved to be the norm, not the monastic community or the desert solitary—those ascetic ideals which, developed out of context and proportion, confused medieval society and confounded the habit of Communion. If

[1] The presence of *και νηστεια* in the MS is assumed, *propter spatium*. See the edition of the text by Sir Frederick Kenyon, fasc. II (1933), p. 11.

this argument is sound, and if Dearmer had been able to perceive it, it might have led him rather to accept some of his evidences and to reinterpret them, than, as sometimes appears, to explain them away. It also makes Fr Thurston's pamphlet a far more telling piece of advocacy against the obligation of the eucharistic fast than if he had succeeded in refuting Dearmer at every point; of that we shall treat below.

Fasting communion could not become a possibility while the Eucharist was conjoined with the Agape, and followed it. St Augustine's opinion, in the letter to Januarius, that the separation of the one from the other and the imposition of fasting was St Paul's work —that which he "set in order" when he came to Corinth after the first Epistle (1 Cor. xi, 33 f.)—has had much weight in the history of this controversy. That his interpretation of St Paul's words is forced is manifest from the evidence of the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic age, which Dearmer next examines. Fr Thurston does not assail the argument in this part of the book. Some writers would be less assured than Dearmer that cc. IX and X of the *Didache* refer to the Eucharist as we know it, or that that work positively assumes Agape and Eucharist to be united still (the authorities are reviewed by Dr Srawley, *The Early History of the Liturgy*, 2nd ed., 1947). But the *Didache* has no reference or allusion to a eucharistic fast, whereas it enjoins a fast for one or two days before baptism. The divergence of Agape and Eucharist happened locally from the mid-second century on; the evidence of Pliny (Kidd's *Documents*, i, No. 14) is ambiguous, and is interpreted by Dearmer in c. VI *against* separation; and the Agape in church survived to be forbidden by the Trullan Canons, 692, and in Armenia to a century after that.

Before Dearmer reviews the so-called "evidences" of the early centuries, he inquires what is meant by *fasting*. There is first *privation*, "having taken nothing" (Acts xxvii, 33), a phrase which is more likely to imply "having had no formal meal" than having allowed neither drop nor morsel to pass the lips. Secondly, *penitential fasting*, a voluntary discipline at first, then systematized into the fasts of Lent, Wednesdays, Fridays, Saturdays, and vigils, "and meant in general going without the midday dinner, the *prandium*, and not having a set meal till supper, *cœna*." This again did not preclude absolutely every drop or morsel. *Jejunium*, therefore, is *abstemiousness — parsimonia victus abstinentiaque ciborum* — until the formalism of the Middle Ages defined it otherwise. Thirdly, *in a fit state* to conduct serious business, or to perform juridical or spiritual functions—*i.e.*, *sobrius*, and therefore, in view of the midday heat and the social customs of the day, *non pransus, not having dined*. The distinction of this meaning from the fourth, *having had no breakfast* (*jentaculum*), nothing since the midnight before, is the keystone in Dearmer's argument. Fr Thurston scoffs at it; he expresses distaste for the notion that bishops might, unless protected, be too "fuddled" to confirm or ordain after dinner; he does not succeed, in our judgment, in reducing its weight.

Thus prepared, Dearmer examines the authorities quoted by exponents of the *no-breakfast* fast, and begins with four now admitted forgeries—II Clement (which referred really to a fast after Communion), Bishop Soter, quoted in the Forged Decretals, a canon fathered upon the Council of Nicæa, and the alleged letter of St John Chrysostom to Cyriacus, defending himself against the charge of having given Communion to some after they had eaten. His next "evidence," however, the sixteenth canonical response of Bishop Timothy of Alexandria (died 385), is one which, we hold, Dearmer explained away. (It is the instance quoted by Fr Crehan in his letter to THEOLOGY in May, p. 179, quoted as though Dearmer had overlooked it.) Dearmer is mistaken in alleging Brightman as an authority against the authenticity of this series of Responses; it is the second series which Brightman relegated to the fifth century (*J.T.S.*, vol. i, 1900, p. 248 n.); this question and response are in the first (Migne, *P.G.*, xxxiii, 1295 ff.). Furthermore, Dearmer may be right in referring the question to a "penitential fast which the questioner is supposed to have kept as a preparation for his Communion," but there is nothing in the text or context to say so:

Int. Si quis jejunans, ut communicet, os lavans, vel in balneo aquam bibit nolens: debetne communicare?
Resp. Quia etiam invenit Satanas occasionem prohibendi eum a communione, frequentius hoc faciet.

Ἐὰν νηστεύων ἐπι τῷ κοινωνῆσαι, νιπτόμενος το στόμα ἢ ἐν τῷ βαλανειῷ κατέπιεν ὕδωρ μὴ θέλων· ὀφείλει κοινωνῆσαι;
Επεὶ εὗρεν ὁ Σατανᾶς ἀφορμην τοῦ κωλεύειν αὐτὸν τῆσ κοινωνίας, συχνότερον τοῦτο ποιήσει.

It seems better to accept the question as evidence of a state of mind existing in Egypt (where our study of the altered New Testament texts prepared us to expect it) towards the end of the fourth century, and then to ask the more radical question, What is the relevance of this information as an authority? We have so far heard of no Anglo-Catholic teacher expounding as of obligation the other impediments to Communion contained in this series, impediments based on the manner of women, the marital relation, and the like; why then distinguish? The same question must be asked about Theodore's penitential, where the same set of prohibitions occurs. (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils, etc.*, iii, 187 ff.) They are evidences to us of the beliefs and practices of the times; but as authorities, binding to-day in the English Church, on what ground is one impediment distinguished from another? Our canons and formularies ignore them all.

Tertullian is silent upon fasting Communion in the *De Jejunio*, where one would most expect to find some mention of the rule if he believed in it. Nevertheless, the existence of the rule has been assumed from the question asked in the letter to his wife about her marrying a pagan as her second husband: "Will not your husband know what you taste before all your food? Even if he knows it to be bread, will he not suppose it to have been treated in some shocking way?" The reference is clearly to the custom of domestic reservation, and thence to a known use of the sacrament, nibbled before meals

either as a grace, "sanctifying all meats," or as an antidote to poison. Akin to this is the biographer's tribute to St Melania the younger (quoted by Fr Thurston) that "she never took any bodily food unless she had first partaken in communion of the body of the Lord, which she received more especially for the safeguard of her soul"; and also the injunction in the Egyptian Church Order, c. 230, perhaps the work of Hippolytus, "Let every faithful man hasten, before he tastes anything else, to receive the Eucharist. For if any one receives in faith, should anything deadly be given to him, after this it will not be able to hurt him." Of this document Dom Connolly writes, "There is nothing in the Egyptian Church Order to suggest that the author . . . had any idea in his mind of a ceremonial fast in preparation for Communion."[1] Fr Thurston admits the probability that Connolly is right about the reference only to domestic reservation; but the inference he then draws, that "this principle of 'first before food' can spell nothing but fasting Communion" (p. 9) is wholly unwarranted; it rests on an inversion of *always the sacrament before food, to sanctify or medicate the food,* into *never food before the sacrament, in honour of the sacrament,* an inversion as improper as it is apparently simple. Moreover, in support of this erroneous conclusion (p. 18) he deftly (but without categorical statement) extends the authority of Connolly's name over a confusion which Connolly was at pains to unravel. The injunction in the fifth-century *Testamentum Domini,* "but always let the faithful take care that before he eat he partake of the Eucharist, that he may be incapable of receiving injury," Fr Thurston takes to be "an absolutely general injunction, associated with no particular church-office or season" (as were other injunctions to be mentioned below), and "a remarkable confirmation of St Augustine's statement that the 'first before food' rule prevailed throughout the universal church." Dom Connolly, on the other hand, asserts that the compiler of the Testament had reproduced the injunction from the Egyptian Church Order, *understood as we have interpreted it,* and concludes his paragraph with the remark that "the reason alleged for receiving the Eucharist before other food is tasted . . . appears to point to ideas very far removed from any thought of a ceremonial fast *in preparation for* Communion (*op. cit.,* p. 70 f.; the italics are Connolly's).

Domestic reservation, then, provided one set of false "evidences" for fasting communion; the Easter fast produced another. The Egyptian Church Order has, "No one at Easter before the oblation is made shall receive, for he who acts thus, his fast is not reckoned to him." Of this Dom Connolly wrote: "The writer's intention was merely to fix the term of the Easter fast, and no ideas connected with 'fasting Communion' were present to his mind at all. He is professedly speaking of the fast: it is of two days, and ends after the Easter Mass; if any food is taken before that point the Easter fast is broken" (*op. cit.,* p. 70). The derived and expanded passage in the

[1] R. H. Connolly, "The So-called Egyptian Church Order and Derived Documents" (Cambridge, 1916), p. 79, cf. p. 71, in *Texts and Studies,* vol. viii.

Testamentum requires the same interpretation, and Dearmer has it. Fr Thurston (p. 18) alleges it in "strong support" of "fasting Communion as a rule of general observance," and in so doing he errs. He misses the distinction, which Connolly's long study was written to draw, between the form of these injunctions in the Egyptian Church Order and their form in the "comparatively late and unskilful redaction of Eg. C.O., made not earlier than the middle of the fourth century, and perhaps dating from the fifth or sixth century (*op. cit.*, p. 132), and called the 'Canons of Hippolytus.'" In these later canons Connolly does find evidence of a general prohibition of food before Communion (*ibid.*, pp. 69-70): "Let none of the faithful taste anything before he has partaken of the mysteries, especially on the days of the sacred fast." Dearmer quotes the passage, and Connolly's judgment upon it; he quotes also Bishop John Wordsworth on the other side, and gives his own opinion that it is yet another direction for maintaining the penitential fast until after the Easter Communion. Dearmer may be wrong; it matters little to the present argument in view of Connolly's judgment upon the whole document:

> "(It) has very widely, and now for many years, usurped a place in early Christian literature which, I am convinced, does not belong to it, and has been credited with an antiquity and accorded an authority to which it has no just claim; and it seems time that we should cease from attempting to illustrate remote Christian antiquity by citing from it passages due entirely to the late compiler, or such as give only distorted versions of texts found in an earlier work, which work we have in our hands." (*Op. cit.*, p. 134.)

The links supposed to connect St Augustine with St Paul fail one by one. Dearmer's examination of the last, those of the fourth century, SS. Ambrose, Basil of Cæsarea, Gregory Nazianzen, John Chrysostom, and others, passes without detailed challenge in Fr Thurston's pamphlet. The passages alleged from St Ambrose look to the Lenten fast, and the second of them counsels those who falter and take the daily *prandium*, nevertheless to "preserve themselves the more by the heavenly feast"; "many days are of the kind when men come to church directly after noon, and hymns are sung and the oblation offered." St Basil's homily on Fasting gives evidence of the sense in which he understood the word; it is abstemiousness, especially from wine. St John Chrysostom urges, instead of drunkenness and the like, the same temperateness after Communion as before; "since, although it is our duty to be temperate at both times, yet most particularly after we have received the Bridegroom. Before, that thou mayest become worthy of receiving; after, that thou mayest not be found unworthy of what thou hast received" (Hom. xxvii on 1 Cor. xi; John Keble's translation). He teaches penitential fasting in the days of preparation for Communion; there is nothing to show that a rule of fasting reception was ever in his mind. Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, 412, advises how to combine the Resurrection feast with the Epiphany fast, when Epiphany fell on a Sunday; the feast is to be kept by a morning meal of "a few dates,"

the fast by delaying the Communion until three o'clock, as usual on a fast day. It will be hard, then, with "evidences" thus removed, to support St Augustine's claim to a custom "observed throughout the whole world."

G. R. Dunstan.

(*To be concluded*)

American Letter: No. 5

Certainly a dominant characteristic of Anglicanism is its amazing diversity not only in rites and ceremonials, but also in polity and discipline. The travelled churchman long has been aware of the fact that one is much more likely to be an Anglican without being English, than to be at once English and Anglican. Churches of this communion have become indigenous to a degree seldom realized, and less often understood, by the "stay-at-homes" among us. Indeed, the Englishman enjoying — or tolerating — his first visit to the United States is invariably shocked by our frequent departures from the local tradition to which he has been accustomed. This tradition may be no more than the insular practice of his particular parish or diocese in "the old country." For instance, the writer once was rector of a large Canadian parish held in a state of turmoil by a conflict between two strong groups of English people. Men from the north were violently opposed to the use of our eucharistic vestments on the ground that "these things are never seen in England." People from London insisted with equal vigour that "all English churches use vestments in their daily masses." To be sure, this may be taken as an extreme instance of something that might quite easily occur among "all-American" churchmen themselves. The Virginian often is aghast at "the goings on" in the Anglo-Catholic diocese of Fond du Lac. And Catholic Britishers are constantly amused by the amazing evolutions executed by acolytes in "low church" and "high church" chancels alike. One is always on the *qui vive* lest he have to rush to the rescue of a server on the verge of being throttled by his choker-tight starched amice. But, after all, these are secondary matters. The British churchman is much more likely to be interested in the life and organization of the American Church from the parochial level upwards.

Here we must be content with the broadest of generalizations. The *Parish* is variously constituted under diocesan Canon Laws which, except insofar as they must conform to the *Constitution and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church,* permit wide points of difference. But the general rule is that a mission, administered by a vicar immediately responsible to the bishop, may become a parish after having acquired a specific number of communicants plus financial resources sufficient to insure complete self-support. "Self-support" involves whatever the diocese or missionary district has decided upon. (Sometimes the minimum salary required for the

priest is much too low. Now and then the rector's stipend, together with fees, is much too high.) Once a mission has met the requirements necessary for "parochial status," and has been accepted as a parish by the Convention of the Diocese, it achieves an almost complete independence. Its vestry, chosen by a congregational meeting under rules which may vary from diocese to diocese, elects its rector. Sometimes the choice is made from a number of names submitted by the bishop. Sometimes the bishop is without the power of veto except, of course, when matters of incompetence or moral character enter the picture. Consequently, the appointment to rectorships of priests of whom the diocesan does not approve is not infrequent, though, as a general rule, vestries and congregations will listen to "the godly admonitions of the bishop." After all, the clergy and laity chose him—unless his jurisdiction is a missionary one—and they are governed by a personal loyalty as well as by respect for his office. But, once installed, the rector is all-powerful in theory. Obviously he controls all services, all buildings, all organizations within the parish. He is at once priest and administrator. Yet if by undiplomatic methods he offends the vestry, or causes them to believe that he is "a square peg in a round hole," he quickly finds that the financial resources for his favoured projects are not forthcoming. As the overwhelming majority of American parish churches are without endowments much, if not everything, depends upon the competence of the priest in charge. He is expected to organize the annual "Every Member Canvass" by which the funds are raised not only for the support of the parish itself, but to meet assessments levied by the diocese for its necessities and to sustain the various programs of the National Church in missionary, educational, social, and publicity fields. Consequently, these pressures become so intense that his devotional life is sadly handicapped. His reading is likely to fall behind and, in consequence, his preaching suffers.

On the other hand recent years have seen a notable development in *pastoralia*. "Personal counselling"—a thing quite apart from the confessional—increasingly becomes a function of the Protestant minister and is a widespread practice within the church. This seems to be especially true of the Province of the Pacific, and here may be a reflection of the extraordinary and dangerous reliance of the public upon the psychiatrist. At any rate the city priest, alive to his opportunity, meets a procession of persons, most of them not of the Church, crying out for guidance. Sacramental confessions multiply apace, and often without regard to matters of "churchmanship." While it remains true that there are priests who do not hear confessions, and too many parishes in which specific teaching on penance is not given, it is also true that by no means all competent confessors and spiritual directors are Anglo-Catholics. For instance, in San Francisco the priest most in demand for confessions happens to be an Evangelical. Probably this change of attitude is a result of the war, which flooded the coastal cities with soldiers and sailors, many of whom came from thorough-going Catholic parishes in the east and the middle-west Many a mature priest heard his first con-

fession during the war! And this last, though amazing, is not American. A British naval chaplain, whose ship was in port for repairs after a fracas in the Pacific, came to our cathedral with the plea that someone teach him "how to hear confessions." He said, "You know, this is the first time in five years that I have been asked to hear a confession." But another significant addition to the techniques of the cure of souls is the canonical requirement that adequate pre-marital instruction be given to every couple seeking the blessing of the Church upon their union. This at once opens new doorways to opportunity and deepens one's pastoral relationships. At the same time it adds a heavy load to the already overburdened shoulders of parish priests, most of whom have neither curates nor secretaries.

Many English readers may be puzzled by the general "set-up" of the American Church, and by the different meanings given to familiar terms. "Conventions," "synods," "convocations," "dioceses," "missionary districts"—these are confusing titles in need of explanation. Of course *The General Convention,* meeting triennially, is the governing body of the whole Church. It consists of the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies. The latter is made up of clergy and lay delegates who are elected by the various dioceses and missionary districts. Of less significance, perhaps of very little significance at all, are the eight Provinces, each of which has its own Primate known as "President of the Province." But this "Archbishop" really is no more than the presiding officer of the Provincal Synod, which body in itself is little more than a debating society. The synods cannot legislate, but they do serve a useful purpose for the threshing out of issues likely to be debated at the General Convention, and for educational undertakings especially in connexion with the local application of programs and financial campaigns set up by the General Convention through "the National Council." The National Council is the administrative body, a sort of interim committee with delegated authority, which operates the Church's business between the triennial meetings of the General Convention. The National Council, as it represents the Church at large, finds much of its moral and financial support in The Women's Auxiliary —a vast organization of women with branches in almost every parish and mission devoted to the furtherance of all of the Church's missionary enterprises. This society, while by no means the only organization of women, is the official auxiliary to the National Council. It holds its own great triennial congress concurrently with the General Convention of the Church. The ramifications of all this, if set down, would require far more space than interest would justify. But on the whole the system is efficient. Perhaps the most serious criticism that one could offer would be to say that overcentralization, stripping the Provinces of most of their historical functions and of all their power, results in much loss of human interest. While it is true that the Council itself consists of a small body of bishops, priests, and layfolk who represent pretty well the whole Church and who determine policy, actual administration is in the

hands of an overworked group of employees in New York. And, despite the fact that field secretaries tour the land, missionary bishops and their people, occupying vast areas in distant places, often feel that "the administration" is not sufficiently aware of local conditions.

Perhaps no use of titles for Episcopal jurisdictions is more confusing to non-American churchmen than the apparent interchange of "diocese" and "missionary district." The latter, in fact, is a diocese which receives a great measure of its monetary support from the Church at large through the National Council, and which, for reasons which seem to us to be no longer sound, does not elect its own bishop. Its bishop is chosen either by the General Convention when it happens to be in session, or at other times by the house of bishops. Though the "missionary bishop," as these diocesans are called, must report his expenditures to the National Council, he is probably the modern world's closest approach to the monarchical episcopate of medieval times. While he does have a "council of advice" with canonical powers with which to hold him in check should he overstep his authority, he can be an absolutist and sometimes is. Inasmuch as most of his clergy happen to be "the bishop's vicars," they are not inclined to differ from him even at the annual meetings of their convocations.[1] But with their bishop they are hard-working, lonely men in widely separated places. It is not unusual for a single priest to have five or six little churches in his field, and to drive as much as two hundred miles between stations on Sundays. Even a fairly large parish in a goodly town may mean loneliness for its rector. When I was Dean of Wyoming my nearest priest neighbour was fifty miles to the east, while my westerly brother was one hundred and twenty miles away! The jurisdiction covered some 97,500 square miles served by twenty-two active clergy. The bishop—believe it or not!—travelled an average distance of 65,000 miles each year, most of this in his car. Of course these vast missionary districts are sparsely populated. Wyoming has but 250,000 people, while Utah's 85,000 square miles with 500,000 souls must be ministered to by less than twenty active clergy. Certainly these vast cattle and sheep producing states—state and diocesan boundaries coincide—cannot hope to be self-supporting for at least another century. This is true of Nevada and of several of the other great continental missionary districts. In every instance the bishop is a hard-driven missionary traveller who lives on an income lower than that of many an eastern big city rector. And, despite the tremendous wealth of the nation, the American Church is hard pressed in its efforts to raise money enough for the support of its domestic missionary areas. Often a missionary bishop is compelled to pay utterly inadequate stipends to his clergy, and frequently is forced either to close established missions or to ignore promising fields. Lack of funds obviously means lack of men. At the moment the Bishop of Nevada is

[1] A "convocation" is the synod of a Missionary District, a "convention" is the synod of a Diocese, the "General Convention" is the general synod of the whole Church.

passing through a harrowing experience as the National Council, itself desperately short of money for essential programs, must deprive him of monetary support for vital needs.

The above is a quite inadequate account of the American Church. For instance, it ignores the magnificent plan for the religious re-education of the American churchman now being launched. Yet it may open a window through which the Englishman may catch a glimpse of what we are and what we do.

ERIC MONTIZAMBERT.

Monsieur Portal

IT is good to have a vivid portrait[1] of the splendid Lazarist priest who was known even in his lifetime as the Apostle of Unity. And the sooner it is translated into English and devoured by both Roman Catholic and Anglican readers the better. Here was certainly a man of destiny. It is scarcely possible to dispel the impression that the Abbé Portal's meeting with Lord Halifax in Madeira was a significant moment in the development of the designs of the divine Providence. The great Englishman was, as a disciple of Christ, Portal's equal in zeal, courage, hopefulness, and personal charm. But from the beginning of their friendship, despite his sixteen years' seniority, Halifax was lacking in other qualities conspicuous in the character of his dear friend—in particular in the qualities of realism, reserve, and patience.

The friendship was to find issue after thirty years in the conversations of Malines. But a quarter of a century before it had found consequences even more intensely interesting to the student of the Christian unity movement. In the years that followed their meeting, which took place late in 1889, the Abbé Portal gave his spare moments to the study of the Church of England, and in 1894 published under the pseudonym of Fernand Dalbus an admirable work on Anglican ordinations. The conclusions that he reached were that Anglican orders are doubtful, but he was delighted to find that "eminent theologians and historians like Mgr Duchesne rejected . . . this part of his work, and in their scrutiny concluded in favour of the validity of Anglican orders." In the following year he spent three weeks in England and gained thereby, under the guidance of Lord Halifax, not so much knowledge of the Church of England as of the progress of the Catholic renewal within it. Especially gratifying were interviews with Bishop Creighton of Peterborough and with "Monsignor" Maclagan [*sic*], the Archbishop of York. Finally he was taken to see Archbishop Benson of Canterbury. Here the two friends were checked by the reminder that "there are many of our brethren who do not quite share our opinions, and we have

---

[1] *Monsieur Portal: Prêtre de la Mission*. By H. Hemmer. (Bloud et Gay.) 220 francs.

no right to throw them over." From the beginning there was a stiffness, and maybe a surplus of starch and suspicion in the Archbishop, not to be found at York and Peterborough. But there was also a greater alertness with regard to actual present conditions of the Church of England, and a theological conviction of the great strength of the Catholic doctrine of the undivided church which Archbishop Benson believed had been impaired by recent developments within the Roman communion. Courageous humility at Lambeth and at Westminster would no doubt have profited by the opportunity provided through the labours of these two gallant friends to hasten that amelioration in relationships between the Roman and the Anglican communions which is a matter of present thanksgiving. But, despite the friendly interest of Pope Leo XIII and of Cardinal Rampolla, the tug-of-war at Rome between the Romans friendly to Halifax and his cause and those unfavourable, spurred on by Cardinal Vaughan and other devoted English Roman Catholics, resulted in 1895 in the Apostolic Letter *Ad Anglos*, which ignored the existence of the Church of England, and in 1896 (after the work of a Commission of Inquiry into Anglican orders) in the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*, which declared English orders null and void. Less than a month later the Archbishop of Canterbury died suddenly. He had already prepared a note in reply to the Bull. It appeared as "The Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII" over the signatures of Archbishops Frederick Temple and William Maclagan. The Abbé Portal's first attempt to open the Door of Unity had failed. But he had already left his mark on the Church of England.

Twenty-five years later the Abbé Portal, moved by the Lambeth Appeal of 1920, put forward to Cardinal Mercier his old idea of a friendly conference between Roman Catholic and Anglican theologians. The result was the Malines Conversations. The story is told by the editor of these sketches, the late Canon Hemmer, himself a participator in the conversations. Before they ended Cardinal Mercier and the Abbé Portal, the great souls whose charity so irradiated and warmed the gatherings at Malines that they have since "changed the religious atmosphere of England," had both died.

There is much that may be said in criticism of the conception and conduct of the conversations. The critics have a case against Cardinal Mercier, though Oldmeadow, in his life of Cardinal Bourne, perhaps overstated it. (See the judicious and quiet reply made by the Rev. Robert Kothen, "Catholiques et Anglicanes: vingt ans après Malines.") The proceedings at Malines were "a step in the right direction," Father St John, O.P., has said, "taken by the wrong people." But maybe nothing else would have stirred up or empowered the right people to take it. That step is now being taken in the informal way which Monsieur Portal desired, free from publicity and simply with a view to mutual investigation of the variant doctrinal standpoints of each church, without any regard to immediate official action. During and since the days of Cardinal Hinsley

this patient Good Samaritan work to secure better understanding between the two communions has been and is being done by their priests and ours with the sanction of authority on both sides.

This book is not a history of the Anglo-Roman rapprochement. It is a tribute to an apostolic shepherd of souls, a priest of the mission worthy of his great patron, Saint Vincent de Paul. Indeed, Etienne Fernand Portal deserved perhaps almost as well as his great master to be called the Apostle of Charity. Charity, the queen of the virtues, is also amongst ecclesiastics the hardest to find and to exercise. It is so easy to confuse it with benevolence, esprit de corps, altruism, amiability, or even intransigence. But the Abbé Portal had pondered a great deal upon this divine gift and had thoroughly grasped its evangelical roots. And he knew and exemplified the truth that, being not only redemptive of the sinner but forming also the exercise of the communion of saints, charity transcends ethics, is one with the holy art of friendship, and is the principle of the unity of the church. Like many saints, M. Portal was a living proof that charity, friendship. and love (*agape, philia,* and *eros*) are one in the heart of Christ. The Catholic faith was for him and in him the revelation of this. It was friendship, the outcome of his meeting when a young theological lecturer on sick leave at Madeira with Lord Halifax, which revealed to him his vocation. But the same grace-gift was the genius and strength of his work as Professor of Dogma at Chalons, as Superior of the seminary at Nice and of the new seminary at Paris, and finally as chaplain of the Ecole Normale in that city. It was friendship which made fruitful his deep interest in the Eastern Orthodox as well as in the Anglican Church. He knew that though even a labourer for Catholic unity must limit his scope of activity, there is a profound sense in which charity cannot be limited. The Cross stretches east and west as well as heavenwards and hellwards, and it is planted in mother-earth. Hence the rich variety of interests displayed in this great Christian humanist. Christ-centred friendship is also *ipso facto* inclusive and expansive rather than exclusive. *Deus qui fidelium mentes unius efficis voluntatis* ("God who makest the minds of the faithful to be of one Will"), the collect of Easter IV, provided a theme dear to his heart: and he emphasized the role of *amitié chrétienne* in the whole work of Reunion. Human affection transfigured and disciplined into supernatural charity in Christ, cordial, costing, individual, Catholic, would be needed to restore the true common life of the Body of Christ. His motive-power was the love of our Lord in His Church. He realized that two kindred characteristics mark the life of the Church: triumphant expansion through humblest charity and growing unity in the Truth. Growth in the Christian life must lead to unity. The nearer separated Christians draw to the heart of Christ, the closer they draw to one another.

He was given opportunity in the last year of his life in important conferences at Brussels and Louvain to sum up the work of an apostle of unity. Prayer, charity, humility, labour, suffering; all raised to a higher power by God's sacred gift of friendship. But

there was one secret of his influence unrevealed at Louvain, and it is precious: Obedience; and this conceived not as an act of quasi-military submission, but as the act of love on the part of one who refuses to tear the Body of Christ. "It is hard," he said to his student friends, "to feel oneself capable of doing something and to be unable to do anything. But nothing solid is done without suffering: and if God wishes to make good use of us, it is good to be reminded that He has no need of us."

The noble aims of the recovery of the structural and visible unity of the Church which bound him to Lord Halifax moved him powerfully and cost him much. But really to penetrate his sense of the meaning of Christian unity we "must follow him [also] into a work more humble and hidden, but perhaps the dearest to his heart, quite simply a work of charity." True disciple of Saint Vincent de Paul in his longing to preach the Gospel to the poor, for the last nineteen years of his life he directed a group of ladies, who went to work and later to settle in the miserable and bitterly irreligious quarter of Paris known as Javel. We are shown how he trained them in *charity*. And as we read, the word that had grown dingy through its association with "good works" is seen recovering its glory precisely in the context of such endeavour. The work was for Christ and for His and our brethren, not for the gaining of proselytes. Truth and Charity are one; so provided Truth was not compromised, Charity disinterested and unfeigned would speak for itself, and the rest could be left to God. The renaissance of Charity, here is one answer to Communism. Communists say there is no such thing as charity: excusably perhaps, for they have seen only philanthropy which loves nothing, unless perhaps it be anthropoids. It lacks the reverence and Christ-discernment of a Vincent de Paul.

And Charity and Unity are one. M. Portal came to see his ladies as forerunners of an apostolate of unity going everywhere at home as well as abroad to draw souls into the peace of Christ. Charity unites. "Seek what unites, not what divides." The work for Christian unity is not to be done only at conferences but in every smoke-room, salon, railway-carriage.

It was in the house at Javel, as he had wished, that M. Portal died on June 19, 1926. He is buried in the chapel of Christ the Redeemer at the children's home at Corbières, which was part of the Javel work. A great window there shows our Lord, who has come forth from the upper room, His prayer of consecration upon His lips, "That they may be one as We are one." The life of M. Portal is a worthy footnote to that prayer.

G. Curtis, C.R.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. J. C. S. Nias, O.G.S., is Rector of Blandford St Mary, Dorset.

The Rev. G. R. Dunstan is Vicar of Sutton Courtenay, Berks.

The Rev. Eric Montizambert is Canon of Grace Cathedral, San Francisco, and Warden of the School of the Prophets.

The Rev. Geoffrey Curtis is a Member of the Community of the Resurrection at Mirfield.

CORRESPONDENCE

VOCATION TO WORK

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

No doubt you are right in your Editorial in the November number in declaring that "there is a great deal of romanticism and, in fact, nonsense" associated with the idea of vocation. But in reacting against this, and suggesting that theologians should "call this particular piece of bluff," you are, I think, in some danger of encouraging Christian people to identify themselves with another and far more noxious piece of bluff put over by those who, unwittingly or otherwise, confuse our so largely "denatured" and perverted economic system with a valid social order. This bluff consists in the suggestion that any remunerative employment performed under "fair" conditions ought to be regarded as in itself acceptable, and that all a man has a right to ask of those who direct the purposes of a society is that "it shall provide him with a job."

I doubt if any large number of sensible people regard their occupations as existing primarily to provide them with opportunities of "self-expression," though I do think that human nature is maimed and society injured by the existence of so many employments which, as now organized, afford little or no outlet for initiative or the exercise of choice. But if, as you affirm, a man is to "find his vocation in doing as well and as cheerfully as he can that part in maintaining the life of the world which is assigned to him," he must have some assurance both about the process by which it has been "assigned to him," and (yet more important) that what it in fact maintains deserves to exist and to be continued. On both these points your Editorial appears to me to be far too optimistic, not to say complacent. A leading layman, himself an employer of wide experience, declared during the war that " the most appalling truth about our peace-time civilization was that most men had ceased to believe that society would suffer if they stopped doing what they were doing." And only the other day a psychological consultant was reported as saying that the primary cause of mental disorder in his experience was the frustration which men encountered in the character and circumstances of their daily work.

The fallacy in your line of argument, as I see it, arises from the assumption that society to-day is only a more highly developed form of a natural order. In such an order no doubt vocations would be discovered and fulfilled much as you suggest that they necessarily

must be, and with a good deal more satisfaction than you hold to be possible, for I do not believe it to be a "hard and prosaic fact" that "the most satisfying jobs are in the end unsatisfying"—at any rate I have known those who have not felt them to be so. In any case, "drudgery" is not the point; men will take any amount of this in their stride for an object that they feel to be worth while. But to ask (*e.g.*) the clerk in a football pool office to console himself with the thought that he is "keeping this world going" is to my mind as unrealistic in practice as it is unchristian in principle.

Yours faithfully,

MAURICE B. RECKITT.

GREENWAYS,
GUILDFORD.

[We are grateful for Mr Reckitt's letter. The Editorial was intentionally concentrated on one aspect of the subject of vocation, an aspect which we consider needs to be emphasized at the present time. We are not complacent about the amount of good, hard work that is being put into jobs that are certainly worth while, nor are we optimistic, unless men are prepared to shoulder more drudgery, about the prospect of maintaining a social order in which there will be liberty to bring to bear the criteria which Mr Reckitt has in mind.—ED. THEOLOGY.]

MARTIN HEIDEGGER

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

May I make a short comment on Mr Belgion's remarks on the "existentialism" that "as with Sartre and his German master Martin Heidegger, issues in atheism"? (THEOLOGY, November, 1949, p. 437). Now that a number of Heidegger's own essays are available, together with a masterly introduction and exegesis by Dr Werner Brock (*Existence and Being*, Vision Press, 1949, 15s.), there is no need to document at length the case for regarding Heidegger, if not as a "theist," at least as a "religious" thinker for whom two things are in principle impossible—pessimism and atheism. In his recent "Letter on Humanism" (not included in the Vision Press volume of translations) he writes:

> "To think about the nature of God, we must first consider the nature of the Holy, and to think about the nature of the Holy we must first think our way into that dimension of thinking within which such questions as to whether God is coming into or whether He is leaving humanity in the present moment of world history can be truly asked at all. That is the dimension of the Holy. The loss of that dimension may be the unique disaster of our time. . . . Because we refer to Nietzsche's phrase about the 'death of God,' we are declared to be atheists. For what could be more 'logical' than to assume that anyone who has ex-

perienced the 'death of God' must necessarily be "godless"? . . . The normal everyday mind is so full of 'logic' that anything contrary to the usual indolence of mere opinion is immediately rejected as the mere negation of the positive which it denies. . . . What we are saying is that to call something a 'value' robs it of its value. To proclaim God as the 'supreme value' is a degradation of the nature of God."

On this point, at any rate, I think there is, to say the least, affinity between Heidegger and Marcel. In the book which Mr Belgion was reviewing there is in fact a passage which it may be worth quoting to suggest the fruitfulness of a confrontation of these two thinkers:

> "God can only be given to me as Absolute Presence in worship; any idea I form of Him is only an abstract expression or intellectualization of the Presence. I must never fail to remember this when I try to handle such thoughts; otherwise the thoughts will suffer distortion in my sacrilegious hands."
>
> (*Being and Having*, p. 170.)

It may be worth noting, also, that both Heidegger and Marcel have been profoundly influenced by Rilke's *Duino Elegies*. (See Marcel, *Homo Viator*, "Rilke, Témoin du Spirituel.")

This note is only intended, of course, to suggest that it is incorrect to dismiss the thought of Heidegger as "atheist," and that there are significant correspondences as well as deep gulfs between the thought of the two philosophers.

Yours faithfully,

STANLEY GODMAN.

BRIARCROFT,
PIPE PASSAGE,
LEWES.

[The reviewer writes: "It is good to know that Heidegger may now be described as at least 'a religious thinker.' I was unaware of the appearance of the volume *Existence and Being*, and I confess that I have not read the 'Letter on Humanism.' But Heidegger's remarks on 'the holy' do not affect the point I made, that Marcel is in the ontological tradition, a tradition biblical and Christian, and that Sartre and Heidegger are not."]

BOOK REVIEWS

HIS SERVANTS THE PROPHETS. By E. W. Heaton. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

LIVES OF THE PROPHETS. By S. L. Caiger. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

THE TRUTH OF THE BIBLE. By M. R. Newbolt. Dacre Press. 4s. 6d.

These three books are all intended for the general reader, though their aims are different; they might be described, respectively, as insight, information, and instruction. Mr Heaton holds that those elements in Christianity which derive from the faith of the Hebrew prophets have become obscured since the second century A.D., and

that it is necessary for the Church to recover this faith if she is to appeal to the modern man who responds to the prophets' moral earnestness, while lacking their convictions about God. He sets out, therefore, to examine and describe the distinctive prophetic contribution to religion. At the outset he is confronted with the problem which soon meets all students of this topic—what was the relation of the prophets of the eighth century B.C. and later to the whole religious system of Israel which surrounded them? At least Mr Heaton does not shirk an answer. The canonical prophets formed a "revolutionary movement." They "enter the scene almost as mysteriously as the figure of Melchizedek in Genesis"; on the other hand, their teaching is "indissolubly bound up with the work of Moses" and the faith of the wilderness period. Perhaps this is rather like trying to have one's cake and eat it. We are forced to ask how the tradition was handed down in Israel from the Exodus period to the time of the great prophets, and what was the prophets' connexion with their forerunners in this faith. The truth appears to be that, apart from memories of the actual deliverance from Egypt and the conquest of Canaan as examples of the mighty acts of God, there are hardly any elements in Hebrew religion which can certainly be assigned to the brief wilderness epoch, and may not equally well have developed before or after that time. In other words, it is possible to exaggerate the antagonism of the canonical prophets to many of the characteristic features of the religion of their day. In view of the many passages in their books which speak approvingly of the *nᵉḇī'īm* in general, it is hard to believe that the canonical prophets did not think of themselves as standing in the same tradition as the so-called "professional" prophets: Prof. Rowley's essay in the Eissfeldt *Festschrift* makes it doubtful if even Amos rejected the term *nāḇī* as a description of himself. It must be remembered that we have hardly any oracles of the pre-eighth century prophets: if we had only his biography in 2 Kings xix and xx, should we not class Isaiah as a mere patriot and thaumaturgist in the best Elisha tradition? Similarly, in his discussion of the prophetic attitude to sacrifice, Mr Heaton does not refer to the weighty grounds for believing that the canonical prophets had close connexions with the cultus. Parallels in the ritual texts of surrounding civilizations—for example, a passage in the Ras Shamra tablets very closely resembling Amos v, 21 f.—show that we must not take the prophetic "denunciations" of sacrifice too literally.

With these reservations, Mr Heaton's book is full of good things. His remarks on some of the well-worn clichés of Old Testament study, such as "group punishment" and "nationalism and universalism," are very fresh and revealing. And the student who works through the valuable pages of Biblical references will gain a conspectus of the prophets' teaching not easily to be found elsewhere.

Mr Caiger's book is an expanded re-issue of a work first published in 1936. It provides an account of the life, teaching, and historical background of each of the prophets from Samuel to Daniel, with a very useful chronological table at the end of every chapter. The

author's style tends to exuberance, and his lively imagination often outruns the Biblical evidence—Malachi's "daughter of a strange god," for example, becomes "the exotic charm of some fair Egyptian's painted face, the sensuous dancing of a Persian houri." Mr Caiger claims that he has not ignored the "assured results of Biblical research." On the whole, the claim is justified: but the reader should be warned that the remarks on the Ark on p. 16, the conjectures about Jezebel's share in the development of the Hebrew alphabet (p. 42), the apparent ascription of JE to the Deuteronomic school (p. 159), and the view that the synagogue owes its origin to Ezekiel (p. 251), would be regarded as distinctly fanciful by most Biblical critics.

The Truth of the Bible is one of the *Mirfield Books*: its "essential orthodoxy" is guaranteed by an editorial committee consisting of members of the Community of the Resurrection. It sets out to show what is the real meaning of the Bible for Christians, and the book will certainly prove valuable in revealing to a wider circle of readers the approach to Scripture associated in this country with Fr Hebert and other scholars. It is perhaps surprising that Canon Newbolt is still so much under the spell of the theory of "progressive revelation." An exposition for the ordinary reader of the theology of the historical books of the Old Testament is very much to be desired—quite rightly, he will not be satisfied with being told that these writings are just the first faltering steps along the right road. Also, Canon Newbolt says several times that the Bible is "the product of the Church." If this implies anything more than the truism that the Scriptures were penned by people who were members of the Church of Israel or the Church of Christ, it needs full and careful explanation. Only too often, when used by churchpeople, the phrase serves as an excuse to avoid the Christian's duty of reading and obeying God's word written.

J. R. Porter.

Oriel College,
Oxford.

The Sayings of Jesus. By T. W. Manson. S.C.M. Press. 21s.

The separate publication of the second part of *The Mission and Message of Jesus* (1937) in Prof. Manson's *The Sayings of Jesus* (1949) is a boon for which students and teachers of the New Testament have been looking for a very long time. It was this section which gave distinction to the earlier work, and its appearance in a new form is heartily to be welcomed.

In a compact and clearly written Introduction, Dr Manson discusses the Christian Gospel and the Teaching of Jesus, the History of the Tradition, the Sources, the Form of the Teaching, and, finally, its Meaning and Permanent Value. Then follow in succession exegetical studies of the document Q, the teaching peculiar to Matthew, and the teaching peculiar to Luke. In the Introduction

there is a welcome insistence on the importance of oral tradition. Dr Manson reminds us that, in the second quarter of the first century, there must have been "literally thousands of people in Judæa and Galilee who had at one time or another seen Jesus, and could tell some story about Him or repeat some saying of His." The well-known statement of Papias, when taken in its simple and natural meaning, is said to fit such a document as Q "like a glove." Particularly valuable is the discussion of Bussmann's hypothesis, all too little known in Great Britain, in which R, a collection of sayings originally written in Aramaic, is distinguished from T, a Greek source, which accounts for the close wording between the Gospels of Matthew and Luke in many of the Sayings. Dr Manson thinks that Bussmann's case is not convincing, and that it is more likely that the literary data are to be explained by the overlapping of sources. His general position corresponds closely with the views of the late Dr Streeter both as regards Q and the sources M (used by Matthew) and L (used by Luke). As regards the source M, Prof. Manson endorses the growing opinion that many of the passages assigned to this collection are coloured by Jewish-Christian ideas, about forty verses being described as doubtful versions of what Jesus actually said.

More general interest is stimulated by the exposition of the Sayings. On almost every page some suggestive and striking comment is made, and there are frequent references to the original Aramaic which lies behind the Greek translation and the English rendering. Among many examples of discerning exegesis the sections on the Mission Charges in Q, Mark, M, and L, and those on the Lukan eschatological discourses in Luke xvii, 22-37 and xxi, 5-36, stand out as classical discussions of problems which concern the ideas of the Kingdom of God, the Parousia, and the Son of Man. Opinion is divided on the question of the communal interpretation of the term "Son of Man," but even scholars who hesitate to endorse this view recognize that the communal reference cannot be dismissed out of hand, and that the concept of the Son of Man is thereby brought into the closest connexion with the doctrines of the Incarnation, the Atonement, and the Church. Especially challenging is the comment on Luke xii, 8 f.: "It is, I think, more probable that the distinction is a real one, and that the 'Son of Man' here stands for the Remnant, the true Israel of which Jesus is the head" (p. 109), and the similar interpretation given to the Saying in Luke xvii, 25. In Passion-sayings like the latter the hesitation one must feel is whether sufficient weight is given to the reference of Jesus to Himself.

Grateful as we must be for the re-issue of Prof. Manson's work, we are entitled to regret that sufficient use has not been taken of the opportunity to revise the book completely and to add a further section on the Markan Sayings collection. The explanation that extensive alterations are impracticable, since the new edition could only be made by a photographic process, is not convincing, and we could wish that the publishers had grasped a great opportunity more courageously. After an interval of eleven years there must be many

points on which Prof. Manson would wish to express himself differently, and we may say this in spite of his disclaimer, that further consideration of the text has not led him to any serious modification of the interpretation adopted. There are, it is true, three pages of additional matter at the end of the volume of a technical character, and these notes could easily have been trebled. The explanation of the absence of a parallel treatment of the Markan Sayings (additional to parallels in Q) is probably due to the author's loyalty to his former colleagues. At least, so we should interpret the statement that he is not inclined to meddle with a piece of work that was conceived and executed in one sustained effort. The same explanation will also cover the want of a treatment of the Johannine Sayings. Here, of course, it must be said that such an addition would have doubled the size of the volume, and perhaps have placed it beyond the reach of readers who will not grudge its price. Certain it is that we cannot fully appreciate the bearings of a study of the Sayings of Jesus, even those of the Synoptic Gospels, behind which we can see the life of a growing Church, without going on to examine the interpretative element in the Johannine Sayings, which are the crown and climax of the whole. In so far as the re-issue leads readers to press on to this inquiry it will achieve an important part of its undoubted success. For what we are actually given it is impossible to be too grateful, and it is safe to say that *The Sayings of Jesus* will be an indispensable aid to study and a constant incentive and inspiration for a long time to come.

VINCENT TAYLOR.

WESLEY COLLEGE,
HEADINGLEY.
LEEDS.

DIE ABENDMAHLSWORTE JESU By J. Jeremias. Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Göttingen. DM. 6.80.

Prof. Jeremias examines several related problems regarding the words of Institution at the Last Supper:

1. Whether the meal was a Passover or not.
2. (*a*) The form-critical problem of the Passion narratives, and (*b*) the textual problem of the words of Institution.
3. The theological significance both of the meal and of the words.

At every stage of the discussion he adduces such a wealth of scholarship and insight that his monograph is a model of what such critical studies should be. His views will call for the most careful consideration by all scholars.

1. Was the Last Supper a Passover meal? The Synoptic Gospels say yes; the Fourth Gospel says no. Prof. Jeremias makes out a strong and coherent case for the rightness of the Synoptic record. The Fourth Gospel follows, but not consistently, another branch of the tradition which was early established in the primitive communities (cf. 1 Cor. v, 7) connecting the Passover with the Passion. He has illuminating things to say about the traces of the Synoptic view in the Fourth Gospel—almost all the particular evidence which he

accumulates for the rightness of the Synoptic tradition, such as the eating of the meal, after sunset, in a reclining position, and the departure not to Bethany—which was outside the city boundaries—but to the garden beyond the brook Kedron, is to be found also in the Fourth Gospel.

2. A "form-critical" examination of the Passion narratives as a whole leads Jeremias to the conclusion that the words of Institution derive from the oldest part of the records. In a detailed examination of the words of Institution the most fascinating part of the exegesis is concerned with the silence of the Fourth Gospel. This silence Jeremias attributes to the strength of the early Christian *disciplina arcani*. It is not possible to marshal his evidence here; sufficient to say that he has presented the N.T. evidence in a new light. Even the Synoptic accounts of the Last Supper, as Goguel pointed out, are *proprement inintelligible pour le lecteur non averti* (cf. G. D. Kilpatrick on the abrupt end of Luke xxii, 19, which is "deliberate in order to preserve the arcanum of the rite"—*J.T.S.*, 47, 1946).

3. The meaning of the whole action of the Last Supper Prof. Jeremias sees as culminating in the words "in remembrance of me," which he regards as an eschatological reference to the parousia: "that God may remember me" would then be the underlying sense of the words, and this remembering could not be anything else but God's *action* in establishing the Kingdom. The Last Supper is therefore to be seen as involving a share in Jesus' work of reconciliation: in the Last Supper there is a proleptic participation in the reconciling death of Christ.

This view may serve as the basis for a radically eschatological interpretation of the Atonement, which has still to be fully worked out. Prof. Jeremias' monograph is a notable contribution to positive biblical criticism.

R. Gregor Smith.

London.

Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis; Gestalt und Gehalt der Kunst des Lukas. 1. Teil, Gestalt; 2. Teil, Gehalt. By Robert Morgenthaler. Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich. Fr. 10.80 and 7.50.

This is a vigorous reply to the whole "liberal" scepticism as to the historical value of the N.T. narrative, in so far as Luke-Acts is concerned. Dr Morgenthaler accepts the general critical position in so far as Luke's use of Mark and Q is concerned, but endeavours to show that Luke is really a great historian, using his material with great artistic ability with the intention of establishing by historical evidence the truth of what Theophilus has been taught.

There can be no doubt that he is right as to Luke's intention to establish the historical truth of his story. He is certainly right in seeing in Luke's methods of composition, such as his use of chiasmus and the general structure of his clauses, the influence of Greek rhetoric on the one hand and of the LXX on the other. He is par-

ticularly instructive on Luke's use of parallelism, sometimes in the strictly Hebraic form which repeats the same thought in different words, sometimes in the Greek form which makes its point by a sharp antithesis, with a number of gradations between the two extremes. Further, I agree with his insistence that Luke intended his work to be history in the ordinary sense of the word, and that he was right in doing so; if Christianity is not based on history, we may as well recognize that it is based on nothing at all.

Where I should differ from him sharply is in his attempt to assign to Luke the character of a great historian. He is right in seeing that the mere fact that Luke adapts and selects his material to bring out the truth of the Gospel of which he is a witness is no argument against his historical veracity. History is always compelled to adapt and select in order to bring out the meaning of the events which it records, and the credibility of a historian must be decided by the extent to which his selection and adaptation bring out the true meaning of the events; the events must actually have occurred, but they must be the really important events and they must be interpreted in their true light. Now I agree entirely that on the whole Luke has succeeded in preserving a true record of the career of Jesus and the life of the primitive Church up to St Paul's imprisonment at Rome, but I cannot see that he has done it by means of great artistry. Here Morgenthaler is carried away by his enthusiasm for Luke's "rule of two" ("Zweiheitsgesetz"), and by his failure to realize the normal methods of Hellenistic history-writing. (Diodorus and Josephus are far more important for studying him than Thucydides, Cæsar, and Polybius.) In his whole list of "double sections" (1, 97 ff.) in the Gospel I can find only one (the double appearance of the Baptist and Jesus with a long quotation from Isaiah, on which Morgenthaler says much that is interesting) that cannot be explained as due either to his conflation of Mark and Q or to the probability that the two sections occurred in his sources; some of them are purely fanciful, as for instance that in 7, 36 ff. and 8, 1 ff. we have two sections showing Jesus' relations with women. If Luke was really so fond of duplicates, why did he omit the anointing of Mark 14, 3 ff.? In the Acts there is of course the well-known parallelism between the careers of the two great Apostles, but here again it is very doubtful how far Luke is really aiming at a parallel and not simply putting down all the information he had. It is significant that the duplicates in Acts, where Luke had far more freedom in composing and selecting, number only twenty-nine, as against sixty-three in the Gospel. Even so we have to include the two appearances of Agabus, where Luke clearly shows that he is not intending to prove anything by his duplication by the simple fact that in Acts xxi, 10 he introduces him as "a certain prophet named Agabus," quite failing to remember that he has introduced him once already. (Josephus does just the same sort of thing.)

From the preface of the Gospel onwards (which is the conventional Hellenistic writer's way of saying "I have conflated the works of several of my predecessors so as to give a fuller account"), down

to the conventional introduction of a shipwreck scene at the end, Luke is typical of his period. The double quotation in St Paul's speech at Athens may be due either to him or to St Paul; it does not prove that either of them had any knowledge of Greek literature beyond that of the handbook of convenient quotations to show that the Gentiles really believed in one God. And it is almost grotesque to find (2, 33) that he knows how to adjust the language of his characters to suit the occasion, when we find the penitent thief and the Ethiopian eunuch talking Greek scholarship prose!

I have no intention of belittling St Luke's achievement, especially his treatment of the Gospel as being, no less than the Acts, a piece of ordinary secular history; I agree here entirely with Morgenthaler. But he is a historian of his age, who simply compiles his sources, sometimes introducing improvements in the style, at other times leaving it in all its original barbarity. (The Infancy stories are an atrocity in their Hebraism, not because Luke was deliberately using LXX Greek, but because they were composed in that kind of Greek or translated from a Hebrew original by someone who knew no better.) He has a smattering of rhetoric, and uses it sometimes quite effectively, at other times he is too slovenly to improve his sources. But he has given an honest compilation of the sources which were available to him (including some at least of those used by Mark), and so preserved a far more original picture than Matthew.

The result is the Lucan picture of the Christ, which I, at least, find far more impressive and overwhelming than any of the others; I fancy there are many who would feel that without the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son we should have lost something of the heart of the Gospel. But our debt is not to Luke's artistry, but to the fact that he has preserved all that he could find, and what he found was the story of the manifestation in the world of the life of the Word made Flesh.

Wilfred L. Knox.

Pembroke College,
Cambridge.

Les Rites et Prières du Saint Sacrifice de la Messe. II, III.—La Messe des Fidèles. By Aug. Croegaert. H. Dessain. Malines. 270 frs.

The first volume of this work (reviewed in Theology, May, 1949) contains twenty-six outlines on the Mass of the Catechumens for the use of preachers and teachers. Volumes II and III each contain thirteen on the Mass of the Faithful. In Volume II the first eight of these are devoted to preliminary notes on the Sacrifice of the Mass and those who offer it. The remaining five are concerned with the chant, prayers, and ceremonies of the Offertory, with the eucharistic bread and wine, the sacred vessels, and the use of incense.

In outlines VII and IX the author brings out very clearly that in early times the faithful twice approached the altar in the course of the service; first, as he says elsewhere (Vol. III, p. 332), "pour offrir leurs oblations matérielles de pain et de vin," and secondly "pour

reçevoir leurs oblations consacrées." He scarcely, however, lays sufficient emphasis upon the fact that in early times it was only intending communicants who "offered," the non-communicants (catechumens and penitents) having already left the church before the Offertory began. It was natural, therefore, that when a decline took place in the frequency of communion, it should have led to a corresponding decline in the frequency of "offering," until, by the time that the great mass of the laity had become accustomed to communicate at Easter only, the primitive type of Offertory had fallen into almost complete disuse. The change from primitive to medieval practice in the matter of communion was a change of the utmost importance, and a survey of the causes responsible for it would have added to the value of this book.

The greater part of the evidence bearing on the subjects so far discussed has long been known and gives rise to no very radical differences of opinion. The opposite is the case with the early history of the Anaphora, which is the first topic dealt with in Vol. III. During the last fifty years a quantity of new evidence has come to light, and scholars are still divided about the conclusions to be drawn from it. Canon Croegaert provides his readers (pp. 13 to 35) with a collection of documents which contains many of those which have long been known as well as most of those recently discovered. This collection is up to date in that it includes the Strasbourg and Louvain papyri, but is less than fully representative in that it omits The Dialogue with Trypho XLI, the relevant passages of St Cyril's Catechetical Lectures XXIII, and the Anaphora of the Testamentum Domini. It is followed by a list of the component parts of the traditional Anaphora which the author believes can be deduced from the documents. His conclusions were once almost universally accepted; but those days are past, and some reference should have been made to the present state of opinion on the subject.

Less debatable matters are reached when we come to the actual Canon Missæ, and the notes on it and on the remainder of the Rite provide a useful commentary. But in view of the author's constantly reiterated insistence on the congregation's participation in the service it is surprising that when dealing with the silent recitation of the Canon he does not mention E. Bishop's suggestion that the introduction of this practice "may involve the passage from a system of eucharistic common prayer to one of assistance at mass, from a recital by the celebrant of the prayers aloud as if common to the people along with him to a silent recitation in which his prayer is as it were divorced from theirs." For if this suggestion is well founded the adoption of silent recitation was a symptom of the very tendencies which the Liturgical Movement is most anxious to correct.

In spite, however, of a few omissions and questionable conclusions, these volumes are a rich storehouse of information and have something of the character of a compendious encyclopedia.

There are excellent illustrations of some magnificent pieces of church plate and an adequate index.

G. A. Michell.

Storrington.

More About the Early Methodist People. By Leslie F. Church. Epworth Press. 12s. 6d.

David Hill, Friend of China. By Harold B. Rattenbury. Epworth Press. 8s. 6d.

Dr Church has now written the promised sequel to *The Early Methodist People* (reviewed in Theology, December, 1948). It deals with their social relationships, occupations, and literacy; persecution; the local preachers, with a chapter on women preachers; social service; and worship, public and private. The hoary errors that the early Methodist preachers were almost illiterate, and that they preached a narrow pietism, divorced from social reform, have been refuted before, but seldom with such an abundance of evidence, drawn from so wide a range of sources. The account of early Methodist worship, the Love-Feasts, Watchnights, Covenant Services, and so on, is particularly interesting, though a full history of this subject remains to be written.

The assertion, often made and probably sometimes doubted, that Methodism was, among other things, a sacramental revival here receives supporting evidence; moreover, the reason which led Wesley to the drastic step of ordaining Coke was his concern that the American people should not be deprived of the Sacraments. On pp. 222 and 259 the point is obscured that it was Coke, not Wesley, who ordained Asbury successively as deacon, elder, and Superintendent, though of course his appointment as Superintendent was first made by Wesley. Those who wish to know more fully how Wesley came to ordain and how the Methodist preachers came to administer the Lord's Supper, topics only incidental to Dr Church's narrative, can conveniently find the facts in A. W. Harrison, *The Separation of Methodism from the Church of England* (Wesley Historical Society Lecture, No. 11). It is curious that Wesley's ordination of Coke, already an Anglican priest, as Superintendent has received comparatively little recent discussion. Methodists find their origin rather in the "heart strangely warmed" in 1738 than in the hands laid on Coke in 1784, and many Anglicans presumably regard the action as too clearly invalid to be important. Yet the letter in which Wesley explained his action (*Letters*, ed. Telford, VII, 238-9) is well worth study, not so much for its remark on the right of presbyters to ordain, but as typical of his whole approach. His mind worked in a pragmatic way, as we see also from Dr Church's amusing account of his gradual recognition of women preachers. "God owns them," he said, "in the conversion of sinners, and who am I that I should withstand God?" (p. 137). Similarly, as evidence that God owned the whole Methodist people, Dr Church cites Archdeacon Paley, who wrote of the early Christians, "Perhaps their mode of life, in its form and habit, was not very unlike the *Unitas Fratrum*, or the modern Methodists" (p. 221). This volume might be summed up in a sentence of Wesley's, which is quoted incidentally, "The whole work of God termed Methodism is an extraordinary dispensation of His providence" (p. 139). How far that verdict is justified,

and what actions that verdict would justify, the reader must judge, but he cannot complain of lack of evidence.

One of the practices of private worship which Dr Church records as having prevailed in early Methodism was that of writing and periodically renewing a personal covenant with God; and the practice was adopted a century later by David Hill, as we learn from p. 34 of Mr Rattenbury's account of him. An official biography by W. T. A. Barber of this great Methodist missionary, who worked in China from 1865 to 1896, has long been available, but it was written at a time when it was too early to use the intimate personal documents which survive. But now the present President of the Methodist Conference, himself a distinguished China missionary, has by permission of the family made good use of this unpublished material and written a vivid portrait of one who has clearly been a constant source of inspiration to him, as he has to many others.

A. Raymond George.

Wesley College,
Headingley.

SHORTER NOTICES

Poems: Grave and Gay. By William Barnes. Selected and edited by Giles Dugdale. Longmans (Dorchester). 6s. 6d.

This is a selection of sixty poems, chosen from every period of William Barnes' poetical development from 1820 to 1866. To many, as to the reviewer, he will probably be hitherto unknown, and the many dialect poems are merely puzzling to those unfamiliar with the Dorset dialect, even if they do convey a strong impression of the racy humour of the soil (*e.g.*, Sam'el down vrom Lon'on). During his lifetime he was popular in his own county and admired by poets and critics as diverse as Tennyson, Matthew Arnold, and Palgrave. But this collection evokes a fast-disappearing tradition of piety, hard work, sturdy humour, and delight in the ardours as well as the beauties of rural life. Perhaps Dorset, in corners unknown to the tourist trade, still shelters some present-day, unspoiled William Barnes. Even so, he would probably have views on rural water supply which, since this author had never heard of the possibility, did not worry him.

Oliver Tomkins.

The Imitation of Christ. By Thomas à Kempis. Translated by Edgar Daplyn. Latimer House. 6s.

This is a translation into modern English which many will find more readable than the versions that use archaisms. It is based on the full text of the autograph manuscript of 1441, and is pleasantly produced.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Wilber Marshall Urban, *Beyond Realism and Idealism* (18s.).

AUBIER (PARIS): Serge Boulgakoff, *Du Verbe Incarné; Le Paraclet* (n.p.); Karl Adam, *Vers L'Unité Chrétienne* (n.p.).

BEACON PRESS (BOSTON, MASS.): John W. Flight, *The Drama of Ancient Israel* ($2.75).

G. BELL AND SONS: H. Butterfield, *Christianity and History* (7s. 6d.).

BLACKFRIARS: Kenelm Foster, O.P., *Saint Thomas, Petrarch and the Renascence* (Aquinas Paper No. 12) (1s. 6d.).

BURNS OATES: J. P. de Caussade. S.J., *On Prayer* (12s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: Stanley Morison, *English Prayer Books* (12s. 6d.) [3rd edition, expanded and illustrated; the 1st edition was reviewed in THEOLOGY, September, 1945.]

CARROLL AND NICHOLSON: Robert Sencourt, *Heirs of Tradition* (15s.).

DENNIS DOBSON: W. S. Lilly (Ed.), *A Newman Anthology* (10s. 6d.). [Reissue of Characteristics from the Writings of John Henry Newman; Introductoin by Henry Tristram.]

EAST AND WEST LIBRARY: *The Books of the Maccabees* (5s. 6d.).

HOLLIS AND CARTER: Thomas Merton, *Seeds of Contemplation* (8s. 6d.).

HUTCHINSON: Sir Henry Slesser, *The Middle Ages in the West: A Study of European Unity* (21s.).

KAISER VERLAG: D. Heinrich Vogel, *Christologie I* (DM. 26).

LONGMANS, GREEN: F. W. Crofts, *The Four Gospels in One Story* (8s. 6d. and 5s.); A. D. Power, *The Proverbs of Solomon* (6s.); Margaret Cropper, *Flame Touches Flame* (10s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: *Calling all Church People* (1s. 6d.); Arthur Bennett, *Rural Evangelism* (2s. 6d.).

NATIONAL SOCIETY AND S.P.C.K.: *Syllabus of Church Teaching and Prayer Book Instruction* (Dioceses of London and Southwark) (2s. 6d.).

NISBET: Emil Brunner, *Christianity and Civilization: Part II, Scientific Problems* (10s.); Reinhold Niebuhr, *Faith and History* (16s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Aage Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament,* Vol. I (25s.), Vol. II (30s.); J. W. C. Wand (Ed.), *Recovery Starts Within* (6s.).

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF ENGLAND: F. W. Armstrong, *The Doctrine of Predestination: its meaning and value for Religion to-day* (6d.); J. H. Ross, *What is an Elder?* (1s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: H. A. Hodges and Others, *Man and his Nature: Broadcast Talks on Religion and Philosophy* (3s. 6d.); R. F. Bailey, *Saint John's Gospel* (7s. 6d.); Harman Grisewood, *Broadcasting and Society* (2s. 6d.); Daniel T. Jenkins (Ed.), *The Doctor's Profession* (4s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: Jakob Jocz, *The Jewish People and Jesus Christ* (21s.); Charles Smyth, *Dean Milman* (1791-1868) (2s. 6d.); John Stewart, *It Quite Slipped My Mind* (2s.); C. B. Coles, *All Young Men Born between . . .* (6d.); Brother Edward, *Twice Upon a Time* (4d.).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS: W. M. Green, *Augustine on Pride as the First Sin* (n.p.).

ZWINGLI-VERLAG (ZÜRICH): Christian Maurer, *Ignatius von Antiochien und das Johannesevangelium* (Fr. 9.80).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher